

### REMARKS

Claims 12-22 are pending in this application. None of the claims were amended in this response. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 12-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Weinberger (US Pub. 2001/0050636). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Specifically, Weinberger, fails to teach or suggest the features of “a plurality of parasitic transmitters, wherein said transmitters are located marginal to the planar patch antenna and are each embodied so as to be free of a high-frequency interface, wherein the parasitic transmitters are arranged as line-type conductor structures, whereas the structures of the planar patch antenna are arranged as sheet-type conductor structures” as recited in claim 12.

Applicant notes that Weinberger was briefly addressed in the background of the present application (see [005]; Weinberg’s foreign priority is based on EP 1 024 552 A2). The antenna of Weinberg is a multiband antenna consisting of a combination of multiple different types of antenna (i.e., planar-inverted “L” and “F” - see Weinberg [0020-24]) that are fed at one point. However, the present application distinguishes itself from the Weinberg configuration by providing a more compact and more easy-to-manufacture structure. Also the claimed multiband antenna array allows for different types of coupling between the planar patch antenna and the parasitic transmitters. The type and strength of the coupling makes it possible either to enlarge the bandwidth of a resonance generated by the antenna patch or to integrate an additional resonance (see present specification, [0015]).

Weinberger does not teach or suggest parasitic transmitters, where each is embodied to be free of a high-frequency interface. The Office Action relies on FIG. 5L (recreated in the Office Action as FIG. 1-OA), however, this figure is clearly based off the disclosures in FIGs. 1-4, which shows the planar patch antennas being arranged in different configurations. Also, Applicant cannot find in Weinberger where any type of line-conductor structure is disclosed. Furthermore, the planar patch antenna of FIGs. 5A-L show the different antennas being coupled directly to one another - it is not understood how this configuration would make a peripheral antenna (being interpreted as a “parasitic transmitter” in the Office Action) “free of a high-frequency interface.” For at least these reasons, Applicant submits the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 12-22 are both novel and non-obvious over the art of record. The Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. A petition for a one-month extension of time also accompanies this Response. If any additional fees are due in connection with this application as a whole, the Examiner is authorized to deduct such fees from deposit account no. 02-1818. If such a deduction is made, please indicate the attorney docket no. (117393-030) on the account statement.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY 

Peter Zura

Reg. No. 48,196

Customer No.: 29177

(312) 807-4208

Dated: August 2, 2007